

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 2-5 are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holtman (US 4,640,409). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holtman in view of Saito et al. (US 5,934,663). Claim 4 was not treated with respect to the prior art due to its alleged indefiniteness.

Claim 1 has been canceled and replaced with new claim 5. Also, claims 2-4 have been amended as illustrated above. Claims 2-5 are believed to be definite.

Applicants submit that the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims of the present application. In particular, Holtman does not teach or suggest a group of gears which is connected to a pair of rollers and has a gear ratio defined as B/A , which is composed so that the peripheral velocities of each of the pair of rollers are approximately equal to each other, such that $(B/A) \times (G/R) \doteq 1$.

Holtman only defines two pairs of conveyor rollers, and the technique has no relation to a roller system for transferring a copy sheet by pinching the copy sheet between the rollers by pressing of the rollers. As indicated in Fig. 1, the apparatus of Holtman is structured such that a pair of conveyor rollers 5, 6 with rubber covering layers is rotated by a drive roller 3 disposed in between. Holtman discloses in claim 4 (col. 4, lines 52-56) that the diameters of a drive roller 21 (see FIG. 3) and non-deformable conveyor rollers 24 and 26 are substantially identical, but Holtman does not disclose a diameter R of an elastic roller which satisfies the equation $(B/A) \times (G/R) \doteq 1$, such that the peripheral velocities of each of the pair of rollers are approximately equal to each other. Thus, claim 5 is not anticipated by Holtman.

Also, as mentioned in the Office Action (page 5, numbered paragraph 14), Holtman does not disclose the feature of claim 5 of an elastic roller having rubber of hardness of JIS-A Hs65 to 90 wound around the periphery thereof. Accordingly, claim 5 is not anticipated by Holtman for this additional reason.

Furthermore, Holtman fails to teach or suggest the following features of claim 5:

wherein the diameter R' of said elastic roller before depression, from which R is calculated with a reduction rate Q due to the depression by the rigid roller, is set in the range of $R1 < R' < R2$;

wherein $R1$ is a criterial value of a virtual maximum diameter of the elastic roller calculated such that the peripheral velocity of the elastic roller at the part depressed due to the pressing of the elastic roller against the rigid roller coincides with the peripheral velocity of the rigid roller, such that $R1 = \{(B/A)X(G)\}/Q$; and

wherein $R2$ is a criterial value of a virtual minimum diameter of the elastic roller calculated such that the peripheral velocity of the elastic roller at the part depressed due to the pressing of the elastic roller against the rigid roller with increased diameter defined as $G+P$, where P is the thickness of the copy sheet, such that $R2 = \{(B/A)X(G+P)\}/Q$.

Holtman is completely silent with regard to these features of the claim. Thus, claim 5 is not anticipated by Holtman for this additional reason.

In view of the foregoing, claim 5 is allowable over the prior art. Also, claim 2 is allowable due to its dependence from claim 5.

Applicants submit that claims 3 and 4 are allowable over the combination of Holtman and Saito, at least because of their dependence from claim 5 and because Saito fails to make up for the above-described deficiencies of Holtman.


In view of the foregoing, the application is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance, and prompt favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #100689.53997US).

Respectfully submitted,

October 31, 2006



J. D. Evans

Registration No. 26,269

Cameron W. Beddard

Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDE:CWB:crr
2879565